Strategy Research Project

Equipping the Force

by

Lieutenant Colonel Mark T. Brinkman
United States Marine Corps

United States Army War College
Class of 2012

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1. REPORT DATE *(DD-MM-YYYY)*	**2. REPORT TYPE**	**3. DATES COVERED** *(From - To)*
12-03-2012	Strategy Research Project	

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
Equipping the Force

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER

5b. GRANT NUMBER

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)
Lieutenant Colonel Mark T. Brinkman, USMC

5d. PROJECT NUMBER

5e. TASK NUMBER

5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
COL David Arrieta
Department of Command,
Leadership and Management

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
U.S. Army War College
122 Forbes Avenue
Carlisle, PA 17013

10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)

11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Distribution A: Unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT

The Department of Defense (DoD) has procured over $1.1 trillion worth of equipment over the past 10 years in support of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and budget constraints of 2012 present the DoD with a potential budget reduction of $1 trillion over the next ten years. Funding the sustainment of equipment already purchased will present challenges at the strategic level. Additionally, there are lessons to be learned on the requirements development process and the acquisition cycle that can be applied to ensure the U.S. military enters future combat with the greatest technological edge feasible.

15. SUBJECT TERMS
Acquisition, Readiness, Requirements

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			**17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT**	**18. NUMBER OF PAGES**	**19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON**
a. REPORT	**b. ABSTRACT**	**c. THIS PAGE**			**19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER** *(include area code)*
UNCLASSIFED	UNCLASSIFED	UNCLASSIFED	UNLIMITED	24	

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

EQUIPPING THE FORCE

by

Lieutenant Colonel Mark T. Brinkman
United States Marine Corps

Colonel David R. Arrieta
Project Adviser

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Lieutenant Colonel Mark T. Brinkman

TITLE: Equipping the Force

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 12 March 2012 WORD COUNT: 4,945 PAGES: 24

KEY TERMS: Acquisition, Readiness, Requirements

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The Department of Defense (DoD) has procured over $1.1 trillion worth of equipment over the past 10 years in support of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and budget constraints of 2012 present the DoD with a potential budget reduction of $1 trillion over the next ten years. Funding the sustainment of equipment already purchased will present challenges at the strategic level. Additionally, there are lessons to be learned on the requirements development process and the acquisition cycle that can be applied to ensure the U.S. military enters future combat with the greatest technological edge feasible.

EQUIPPING THE FORCE

In support of the Global War on Terror, OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM, and OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM, Congress appropriated record procurement funds to equip the nation's fighting force. These appropriations, peaking at $669 Billion in FY 2008,[1] enabled the military to procure equipment critical to success on the battlefield. Following post conflict draw down trends of defense spending in support of Korea, Vietnam, and the Cold War, the Department of Defense now faces significant budget cuts to normalize the defense budget and support the reduction of the National deficit. While these draw downs are not unique to the military, there are several factors that add complexity to the challenges the Department now faces to include how to maintain the equipment we have procured over the past 10 years, how to ensure critical present and future capabilities are identified, and how to procure these future capabilities in the most effective manner. Readiness, requirements, and the acquisition process encompass critical elements of strategic decisions facing the Department of Defense during the next ten years of budget constraints.

Funds appropriated for the services are traditionally spent on one of the three basic Title 10 responsibilities of train, man, and equip. The volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous global environment place demands on the service that make it impractical to relax training standards, and operational tempo across the full spectrum of military operations supports an increase in manning levels, not a decrease. Given these realities, equipping the force stands to endure the brunt of the imminent budget cuts. During testimony by the Service Chiefs to the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Schwartz stated "at a minimum, they

would slash all of our investment accounts"[2] when referring to the impact of sequestration and a $1 Trillion cut over the next 10 years. With the focus of the Service Chiefs to retain force structure and the combat experience of a military that has been at war for the past 10 years, development and procurement of new systems and equipment, and sustainment of existing equipment stands to endure the most significant impact of upcoming cuts.

The national debt is at a record high of $15 Trillion,[3] the Budget Control Act of 2011 established ceilings in discretionary spending that will cap the Department of Defense budget at $523 Billion.[4] This represents a 6 percent cut to base funding, and a 22 percent cut if Overseas Contingency Operations funding is not appropriated. Additionally, failure of the congressional Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, also known as the "Super Committee," tasked with identifying $1.2 trillion in debt reduction over a ten year period failed to accomplish their objective, resulting in automatic triggers that enact sequestration, comprised of an additional $492 Billion (decreasing the annual budget by an additional $55 Billion per year)[5] cut in defense spending from 2013 to 2021. This reduction, combined with the additional $39 Billion cut directed by the White House[6] will result in $980 Billion reduction in Defense from 2013-2021, and an annual Department of Defense budget of $464.1 Billion in FY 2013. The end result is a 16 percent reduction from the FY 2012 Base budget request and a 31 percent cut in defense spending from the FY 2012 request, if Overseas Contingency Operations funding is not approved, and a base budget slightly below the Department of Defense budget historical average of $482 Billion (FY 2012 dollars).[7]

A cut in the Department of Defense base budget to a level slightly below the historical average during a post conflict period with the National debt at record levels seems very reasonable and almost inevitable, yet they will still present significant challenges to those responsible for the Title 10 tasks of train, man, and equip. The budget control act combined with sequestration cuts will represent a 12.8 percent reduction from the current $526 Billion FY 2011 base budget, and an apparent reduction of 32 percent in appropriated funds if the $159 Billion in Overseas Contingency Operations funding is eliminated.[8] The FY 2011 continuing resolution budget consisted of $104.7 Billion for acquisition (19.9 percent of total Department of Defense appropriations) and $80.3 Billion (15.3 percent of total Department of Defense FY 2011 appropriations) for research, development, test and evaluation.[9] This combined $185 Billion represents 35.2 percent of FY 2011 Department of Defense appropriations and also accounts for over 89.7 percent of discretionary spending within the Services when forces structure and operations and maintenance is held at current levels.[10] These cuts will come at a time while the military is still engaged in the war in Afghanistan. In spite of these significant cuts in defense spending, the military must remain ready to fight and win the nations wars.

Past U.S. history has shown that following major conflict, budget reductions incurred as a peace dividend impacted procurement/investment dollars at twice the magnitude of the Department of Defense budget cut.[11] If the current Defense drawdown follows this trend, and Overseas Contingency Operations procurement funds are eliminated, future investment will be reduced by up to 62 percent resulting in an investment account of $55 Billion. The FY 2012 budget request contained $85.3 Billion

for Major Defense Acquisition Programs (MDAP), and $203.8 Billion ($188.4 Billion in base and $15.4 Billion in Overseas Contingency Operations) to fund Department of Defense major weapon systems.[12] This total procurement request of $289.1 billion would suffer crippling cuts if it has to survive on a potential $55 billion budget, resulting in an impeded ability for the military to maintain its technological advantage in future conflicts.

In order to survive these imminent challenges, critical decisions at the strategic level of acquisition are necessary to ensure services continue to meet the Title 10 responsibilities to train, man, and equip. The three areas that must be addressed are: readiness of current equipment on hand, the requirements approval process for future acquisitions, and the acquisition process.

Readiness

In the 10 years since September 11, 2001, the military has procured over $1.1 Trillion worth of equipment,[13] changing the way a soldier is equipped on the battlefield. Comparing a Soldier or Marine from 10 years ago to current warriors will reveal new individual combat equipment, new weapon systems, new vehicles, as well as new communications and intelligence networks. In 2000, individual equipment worn by a Marine on the battlefield, not including weapon or ammunition, cost $1,200 per Marine. Equipment worn in 2010 by the same Marine cost $7,180.[14] The 600 percent increase in cost is not an example of reckless spending, but rather a depiction of the increased reliance on improved technologies in order to accomplish complex missions.

The demands for capability improvements while engaged in combat operations requires the acquisition community to respond not only with better technology, but at a much faster pace than a traditional acquisition program that might field capability in 5-7

years. The traditional cycle of waiting two years for program funding, followed by a year of research and development, a year of testing, and multiple years of procurement does not respond fast enough to the demand of the warfighter engaged in combat with a need for a capability that will enhance mission success, or save lives. SECNAVINST 5000.2E (SECNAVINST 5000 is the Department of the Navy implementation of the DoD 5000 and the CJCS 3170) establishes procedures to respond to warfighting needs via the Urgent Needs Process (UNP).

> An urgent need is an exceptional request from a Navy of Marine Corps component for an additional warfighting capability critically needed by operating forces conducting combat or contingency operations. Failure to deliver the capability requested is likely to result in the inability of units to accomplish their missions or increase the probability of causalities and loss of life.[15]

Procurement of capability against an urgent need follows specific procedures in order to expedite the delivery of the capability. “This process is optimized for speed, and accepts risk with regard to Doctrine, Organization, Training, Material, Leadership, Personnel, Facilities (DOTMLPF), integration, sustainment, and other considerations.”[16] Acceptance of these risk factors yield quicker material solutions produced and fielded to support the mission, but present challenges and expense if these risks are not addressed in the out years.

For example, the Rifle, Combat Optic (RCO), was fielded across the Marine Corps as a response to an urgent operational needs statement. The RCO is a 4 power optic that mounts of the M-16A4 and M-4 Carbine with an integrated bullet drop compensator and illuminated reticle.[17] The RCO was tested to ensure reliability of the sight, mounting interface with the weapon, and accuracy of the integrated reticle. The optic was then procured with Overseas Contingency Operations funding and fielded on

every deployed service rifle within the Marine Corps, and after a few years was designated as the primary sight for the service rifle. The initial risk accepted by the acquisition team and ultimately by the operator to field this system enabled fielding without addressing: 1) manpower impact to support maintenance requirements of the sight; 2) logistical footprint of additional equipment in all the armories in the Marine Corps; 3) rifle rack storage requirements so the weapon can be stored with the optic mounted; 4) additional training time required to zero an additional optic on the weapon; 5) integration of the optic and the weapon to 5th to 95th percentile Marine with respect to weapon system employment and eye relief, and 6) detail system integration of the optic with the weapon system with respect to system accuracy across operational mission profiles. The risk of “loss of life”[18] trumped these DOTMLPF, integration and sustainment risks, so the optic was fielded and has performed superb in combat operations. The issue with this particular piece of equipment is the Marine Corps never committed to making this an enduring capability with the resources required to readdress all the risk areas accepted by the urgent program, and while some of the issues have been addressed, most of them remain open and still concerns that must be cleaned up with a decreasing budget.

In contrast to the RCO, the M-32 Multi Shot Grenade Launcher (MSGL) was procured under an urgent requirement and fielded to deployed combat forces. Shortly after initial fielding, the Marine Corps realized the enduring need for this capability and approved a requirements document with appropriate funding resources to execute a traditional acquisition program of record in parallel. After the initial two years of sustainment for the M-32 had expired, the M-32A1 MSGL was in production and the

Marine Corps and U.S. Special Operations Command began fielding. This traditional program of record addressed the entire DOTMLPF spectrum, with funding requirements for out years sustainment included in the Marine Corps base budget.

The ten years of combat in Iraq and Afghanistan has produced numerous systems procured under urgent requirements, the most expensive being the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicle. The $34.95 Billion MRAP program[19] addressed the survivability requirement for service members to operate in an improvised explosive device (IED) rich environment. Initial contracts for MRAP vehicles were awarded to five vendors after prototype vehicles passed initial survivability testing.[20] Risk was accepted across the DOTMLPF spectrum in order to expedite the fielding of the vehicle. Initial spares for repair followed after initial fielding, contractor support was used for vehicle training and maintenance, and integration of the platform into service doctrinal tables of equipment was disregarded. Vehicles were fielded to meet the specific mission requirements of Iraq and Afghanistan. This rapid fielding saved countless lives but created huge logistical burdens as well as tough questions on the future role of the $34.95 Billion MRAP platform in the Services following OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM and OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.[21]

As of 30 September 2011, the Department of Defense has expended $1.21 Trillion in supplemental funding[22] in support of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, a large percentage of this funding was used to procure, or purchase equipment. All of this equipment comes with a sustainment cost. Sustainment of equipment is paid with Operations and Maintenance funding. In FY 2011, $402 Billion ($292.4 Billion base, and $109.6 Billion Overseas Contingency Operations) of the $685.2 Billion ($525.1 Billion

base, and $159.1 Billion Overseas Contingency Operations) Department of Defense budget was allocated to Operations and Maintenance,[23] and Operations and Maintenance consuming 69 percent of the Overseas Contingency Operations budget, compared to 56 percent of the base budget. A facet of Overseas Contingency Operations, Operations and Maintenance cost is the cost to maintain equipment procured in direct support of OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM and OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM as an urgent need. For urgent programs, the traditional acquisition logistics are bypassed in the interest of speed. Traditional logistics planning ensures all parts to an item are cataloged and provisioned, and all technical and repair manuals are complete and validated. These logistics plans and activities ensure that the military has the ability to maintain the equipment with organic assets, and that through a manpower assessment, that the forces have adequate maintenance personnel to perform the maintenance tasks. Bypassing these efforts in the interest of time results in a more expensive concept of support where contractor logistics support is used, and no enduring sustainment tail is established. Additionally, since these efforts were procured with supplemental funding in support of an urgent need, budget transitions to migrate these costs to base funding were never executed, allowing the Services to abdicate the cost of sustainment from their base budget, leaving significant out year costs and the only plan for sufficient funding is via Overseas Contingency Operations funding.

Without continued Overseas Contingency Operations funding and the projected reductions in the budget, sustainment of this recently procured equipment could consume 100 percent of the base Operations and Maintenance funds allocated to equipment, as well as requiring reprogramming of the limited procurements funds

allocated for investment, leaving no flexibility for future capability. In order to downsize defense spending in years to come, critical decisions will be needed to decide: 1) what equipment to retain and maintain; 2) what equipment to retain and attrit, or retain in a stored lower state of readiness; and 3) what equipment to divest from completely.

The starting point for reconciling the list of all programs executed against an urgent requirement for OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM and OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM begins with the acquisition category (ACAT) 1D MRAP program, down to the lower dollar abbreviated acquisition programs. Program managers would be responsible for providing a cost and schedule to correct the DOTMLPF deficiencies accepted as risk in the interest of expedited fielding of the program. The requirements organizations would be responsible for validating the required capability as enduring. The advocate would prioritize this capability against available funding. For each program, a decision must be made to retain, attrit, or divest. For all programs identified for retention, resources must be allocated to address all the risk assumed in fielding and out year funding for sustainment must be programmed into the base budget. For programs identified to attrit, operating forces must be informed that as systems fail, they will be taken out of the inventory. For systems no longer being employed, funding must be provided for storage of systems. For capabilities identified for divestment, resources must be made available to item managers to dispose, de-mill, or sell via foreign military sales so that no future cost will be incurred for these items. This reconciliation is critical in order to determine base funding requirements before investment in future capability.

Requirements

The challenges for the Service Chiefs to train, man and equip the force become more complex in an environment of constrained resources. Investment dollars become

extremely limited and critical strategic thinking is required to equip the force for tomorrow's conflict. In order to focus resource allocation decisions while also realizing the greatest potential synergy across services, the Joint Capability Integration Development System (JCIDS) was established.[24] The purpose of the JCIDS process is to "identify the capabilities required by the warfighter to support the National Defense Strategy, the National Military Strategy, and the National Strategy for Homeland Defense."[25] This process established a framework enabling strategic planners to asses a future operating environment, determine what critical capabilities are required to succeed in this environment, and then determine the gap between existing capability and required future capability via a Capabilities Based Assessment. The results of the Capabilities Based Assessment would feed into an Initial Capabilities Document (ICD), and with the approval of Joint Requirement Oversight Committee (JROC) and funding, may establish an acquisition program of record to pursue the procurement of the capability. The Joint Strike Fighter, with a single platform identified to meet the needs of multiple services, is an example of a successful program procured as a result of the JCIDS process.

The challenge with the JCIDS process is twofold. First, it is a time consuming bureaucratic process requiring consensus up to the Joint Staff for approval. This attribute proves as a strength when making investment decisions for Major Defense Acquisition Programs (MDAP) (MDAP program "Dollar value...for research, development, test and evaluation of more than $365 million (FY 2000 constant dollars), or for procurement of more than $2.190 billion (FY 2000 constant dollars)).[26] For the smaller programs, the time requirements to complete the JCIDS process serves as a

significant constraint and frequently earns acquisition a reputation of being too slow to respond to the needs of the warfighter. The second challenge of the JCIDS process is the criticality of understanding the future operating environment so the right capability is procured. Secretary of Defense Gates, during a speech at the United States Military Academy at West Point when talking about the future of warfare stated, “I must tell you, when it comes to predicting the nature and location of our next military engagements, since Vietnam, our record has been perfect. We have never once gotten it right, from the Mayaguez to Grenada, Panama, Somalia, the Balkans, Haiti, Kuwait, Iraq, and more.”[27] Comments like this present argument that future investments decisions via the JCIDS process should only be used for strategic assets to operate in the air, sea, and land domain, and that decision on investment for all equipment below this threshold should be subject to a more efficient timely requirements approval process.

During OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM and OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM, requirements officers circumvented the JCIDS process by exploiting the gap in the policy that states, “If there is no ICD for a potential ACAT II or below program, the development of the Capability Production Document (CPD) must be supported by a Joint Urgent Operations Need (JUON)…that defines the capability and has been previously reviewed or validated by the JROC or Service/agency requirement authority.”[28] This language enables the Services to approve and execute programs below the ACAT I threshold in support of urgent needs. In an effort to procure items more rapidly capability requirements were approved under urgent needs and programs were initiated.

On the surface this appears a very viable option, but the devil is in the details. Once a requirements was approved under an urgent classification it was forwarded to the other two critical elements bring this need to a material solution; the Planning Programming, Budget and Execution system, and the Defense Acquisition System (DAS). The Planning Programming, Budget and Execution element would allocate funding for the program, and in the case of urgent needs for OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM or OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM, supplemental or Overseas Contingency Operations appropriated funding was the preferred source for funding. By using Overseas Contingency Operations funding, the Planning Programming, Budget and Execution system could track the cost of the war and categorized this cost as something above and beyond the normal capabilities of the organization unique to the efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

This funding stream works extremely well as long as Overseas Contingency Operations funding is available, but at no time would the Planning Programming, Budget and Execution system roll the cost of procuring or sustaining this capability into the base budget of the Service unless directed. These programs that were procured and sustained with Overseas Contingency Operations funding now present a major funding challenge. For the acquisition element, reacting to an urgent need meant assuming risk to support a more rapid fielding. These risks, as stated earlier, were across the DOTMLPF spectrum. For the Department of the Navy, in addressing the solution execution phase of a program in support of an urgent need states; “This phase begins with the authority to execute the solution and ends with the delivery of a solution meeting an acceptable level of capability, timeline, and quantities, as defined by the

operating forces, and includes a handoff for sustainment and consideration within the normal process."[29] Combining the three critical elements; requirements generation process (JCIDS), budget process (Planning Programming, Budget and Execution system), and acquisition process (DAS) for the procurement of an urgent new capability produces an item with unrefined requirements development based on today's need, funded with supplemental, or Overseas Contingency Operations funding with no ties to the base budget, that was fielded with significant risk in the areas of sustainment and support.

In order to prevent continued future base funding disconnects, clear changes in acquisition and requirements policy must be made that force capability, procured under urgent needs, to face a requirements review board one year after initial fielding to determine if the capability should be; transitioned to an enduring capability, attritted following the immediate conflict, or deferred decision until the following year (1 year deferral max). These changes in policy should be implemented into the Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff Manual CJCSM 3170.01G Operations of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System, and the Department of Defense Instruction 5000.02 Operation of the Defense Acquisition System. The level of review would force the Services to determine if the capabilities procured under an urgent needs statement should be retained as a Service core capability, initiate programmatic to mitigate all risks assumed in the initial fielding, and require appropriate funding to be allocated to support these efforts, as well as, force base funding to be allocated for future year support of the item. This forcing function will align the divergent actions of the three organizations as a result of the urgent handling of the capability, and ensure critical

capabilities are supportable from a fiscal and technical perspective. Once these decisions are made, they must be communicated effectively to the operators to ensure strict adherence in order to prevent continued obligations of funding on a phased out system.

Acquisition

The final and most critical step in accomplishing the mission of equipping the force is the acquisition process. Continuous acquisition reform focused on quicker response times, accountability of leadership, and decentralized execution is critical to ensure a professional military retains essential modern capabilities when tasked to respond to an adversary capable of equipping their force off the open market. Today's global economy drives industry to faster cycle times with respect to design, production, marketing, and product improvement redesign. In all but a few niche capabilities, like combat aircraft, and naval war ships, the demands of the consumer drive the capabilities of industry beyond the tempo once dictated and required by the military.

The strength of the U.S. industrial capacity lies in not just production capacity, but also the ability to implement design changes to a product in a cost effective manner that exploits multiple elements of modern technology. Industry partners, surviving in today's economy are required to implement innovative manufacturing and design processes to remain competitive in the global economy. This cycle time of industry from design concept to production item demonstrates a rapid decision making cycle with flexibility and ingenuity. Acquisition policy and procedures should focus on exploiting this strength of industry to ensure capabilities are delivered in a timely manner and in updated configurations.

Lessons learned during the past 10 years of acquisitions need to be applied to the guidelines established in the Department of Defense 5000 series to ensure agile responsive professional procurement processes are codified. On 01 April 1986, President Ronald Reagan issued National Security Decision Directive 219 to reform acquisitions. In this directive he established the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, and Service Acquisition Executives (AE), and also directed:

> Service Acquisition Executives, acting for the Service Secretaries, will appoint Program Executive Officers (PEO) who will be responsible for a reasonable and defined number of acquisition programs. Program managers for these programs would be responsible directly to their respective PEO and report only to him on program matters. Thus, no program manager would have more than two levels between himself and the Department of Defense Acquisition Executive. Each Service should retain flexibility to shorten this reporting chain even further, as it seems fit.[30]

The current *Operation of the Defense Acquisition System*, Department of Defense Instruction 5000.02, December 8, 2008, states the purpose of the instruction "establishes a simplified and flexible management framework for translating capability needs and technology opportunities, based on approved capability needs, into stable, affordable, and well-managed acquisition programs that include weapon systems, services, and automated information systems."[31] The instruction clearly defines all statutory and regulatory requirements for program execution, and while focused on MDAP programs, it also provides guidance for ACAT II programs and below.

In the FY 2012 budget request, $85.3 billion of the $128.1 billion procurement dollars requested support MDAP programs.[32] The remaining $32.8 billion requested will support ACAT II and below programs. For these programs, the Department of Defense 5000.1 and subordinate Service directives prescribe a "capabilities-based approach to define, develop, and deliver technologically sound, sustainable, and affordable military

capabilities."[33] The only area of the acquisition process not clearly covered in the Department of Defense 5000.1 rests in the execution of a program in support of an urgent need. Lessons learned during the past 10 years of acquisition in support of urgent needs, to include the execution of supplemental or Overseas Contingency Operations funding provide an opportunity to document the procedures for rapid decentralized execution while ensuring checks and balances are established to prevent continued fielding of unsupportable equipment. Further analysis of this streamlined process could possibly provide guidelines for rapid execution of traditional acquisition programs in support of valid requirements, and become the basis for the next phase of acquisition reform.

The leeway provided by SECNAVINST 5000.2E when pursuing a capability in support of an urgent need decentralizes the authority to accept risk in a program. "The urgent need process streamlines the abbreviated requirements, resources, and acquisition process to address mission-critical warfighting capability gaps more rapidly than the normal processes permit."[34] The most significant of these streamlined processes is the consolidation of testing and limited provisioning. Developmental test (DT) results are accepted in lieu of operational tests (OT). OT ensures the material solution will perform all the required capabilities across all operating environments, requiring test event in hot humid, extreme cold, and arid environments, with sand and dust, rain, snow, day and night conditions while in the hands of the operator performing across a full range of missions. The benefit from OT is the ability to discover a flaw in the design of the material solution and implement a change prior to beginning full rate production of the item. The elimination of OT saves significant time and expense for a

program at the cost of a defect surfacing at a later date. The provisioning step of the acquisition process is another extremely time consuming step. During this step, acquisition logisticians assign a national stock number (NSN) to every part of the end item, ensures NSNs are identified correctly in all preventive and corrective maintenance manuals, and establishes stockage of all repair parts in the Service supply system. For developmental items, both of these steps are critical to ensure a good design and a supportable product, but for non-developmental or commercial items, these steps provide far less value at great expense. Traditionally, all of these procedures are complete before the first item reaches the hands of an operator, but programs like MRAP have shown that it is possible for an item to be fielded before all the traditional acquisition steps are complete. For MRAP, the program office fielded as rapidly as possible, and after initial fielding, continued a parallel effort to complete all the statutory and regulatory requirements along with the critical acquisition tasks.

Programs like MRAP, and many other urgent programs succeeded because levels in the bureaucracy that traditionally had the authority to say no, but not the authority to say yes, were removed from execution. President Reagan's National Security Decision Directive 219 directs this simplicity by limiting the structure of the organization, yet methodical sequential mandated processes imposed by the 5000 series directives limit the potential for creative rapid solutions to valid requirements.

The next phase of acquisition reform should focus on the basic fundamental of an accountable AE, PEO, and PM. Empower these individuals to execute creative solutions while holding them accountable for cost, schedule, and performance. PMs should not be allowed to "hand off" a program once the item is fielded, but instead

remain accountable for all facets of the program until the item is removed from service and properly disposed of. Holding PMs accountable until an item is disposed of will require continued engagement, especially for items procured in support of an urgent need where significant risk was accepted in support of rapid fielding.

Reconciliation of all systems procured under urgent requirements, integration of these capabilities into core funding with completed provisioning efforts, systems operational testing where required, and delegated authority along with accountability to program managers is the critical first step. These actions will preserve the capabilities growth of the U.S. military over the past 10 years for critical capabilities, and sets the stage for accurate estimates for future investment during times of constrained resources.

Endnotes

[1] Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), "United States Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2009 Budget Request," (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2008), 3.

[2] "Transcript: Testimony of U.S. Air Force General Norton Schwartz on the impacts of defense sequestration," November 2, 2011,http://www.whatthefolly.com/2011/11/30/transcript-us-air-force-general-norton-schwartz-on-impacts-of-defense-sequestration/ (accessed November 30,2011).

[3] "U.S. National Debt Clock, The Outstanding Public Debt as of 13 Jan 2012," January 13, 2012 web page: http://www.brillig.com/debt_clock/ (accessed 13 January 2012.

[4] Center For Strategic & International Studies, "Supercommittee Fallout and the Implications for Defense," December 2, 2011. http://csis.org/print/33923 (accessed 13 January 2011).

[5] Ibid.

[6] David J. Berteau, Ryan Crotty, "Supercommittee Fallout and the Implications for Defense," December 5, 2011, Center for Strategic and International Studies web page at:http://www.defpro.com/news/details/30374/ (accessed January 13, 2011).

[7] Lawrence J. Korb, Laura Conley, “A Historical Perspective on Defense Budgets, What we Can Learn from Past Presidents About Reducing Spending,” July 6, 2011, Center for American Progress, web page:http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/07/historical_defense_budget.html (Accessed January 13, 2012).

[8] Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), “United States Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request Overview,” (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2011), 1-1.

[9] Ibid., 8-9.

[10] Ibid., 8-4.

[11] Col Roy Osborne, “Marine Aviation,” briefing slides, Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington DC, August 3, 2011. S3.

[12] Office of the Undersecretary of Defense (Comptroller), “United States Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request Program Acquisition Cost by Weapon System,” (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2011), i.

[13] BARR Group Aerospace Online, http:/www.bga-aeroweb.com/Defense-Spending.html (accessed February 17, 2012).

[14] BGen Bullard, “TLS and CMC Fellows Brief,” briefing slides, Headquarters Marine Corps, Washington DC, August 3, 2011. S21.

[15] Department of the Navy, “Secretary of the Navy Instruction 5000.2E, Department of the Navy Implementation and Operation of the Defense Acquisition System and the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System,” September 1, 2011, p.1-40.

[16] Ibid.

[17] United States Marine Corps, *AN/PVO-31A Rifle Combat Optic*, CMC 41R (Weapons Training Battalion, Quantico Virginia, September 02, 2006), 1.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Andrew Feickert, “Mine-Resistant, Ambush-Protected (MRAP) Vehicles: Background and Issues for Congress,” Congressional Research Services,http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/RS22707.pdf January 18, 2011, p.1.

[20] Global Security.Org, “Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) Vehicle Program, Program History 2005-2007,”http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/systems/ground/mrap-proc.htm, (accessed 13 January 2011).

[21] Ibid.

[22] Amy Belasco, “The Cost of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Other Global War on Terror Operations Since 9/11” Congressional Research Service, September 2, 2010, 1.

[23]Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), “United States Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request Overview,” 8-6.

[24]Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction, :Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System CJCSI 3170.01H,” December 15, 2011, 1.

[25] Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction, :Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System CJCSI 3170.01G,” March 1, 2009, A-1.

[26] Department of the Navy, “Secretary of the Navy Instruction 5000.2E, Department of the Navy Implementation and Operation of the Defense Acquisition System and the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System,” September 1, 2011, 33.

[27] Robert M. Gates, Speech, United States Military Academy, West Point, NY, 25 February, 2011.

[28] Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction, :Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System CJCSI 3170.01G,” March 1, 2009, B-3.

[29] Department of the Navy, “Secretary of the Navy Instruction 5000.2E, Department of the Navy Implementation and Operation of the Defense Acquisition System and the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System,” September 1, 2011, 1-42.

[30] Office of the President of the United States, “Implementation of the Recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense Management, NSC-NSDD-219” April 1, 1986, 5.

[31] Office of the Secretary of Defense USD (AT&L), “Department of Defense Instruction 5000.02, Operations of the Defense Acquisition System,” December 8, 2008, 1.

[32] Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), “United States Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request Program Acquisition Cost by Weapon System ” February 2011, 1.

[33] Department of the Navy, “Secretary of the Navy Instruction 5000.2E, Department of the Navy Implementation and Operation of the Defense Acquisition System and the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System,” September 1, 2011,1-2.

[34] Ibid.,1-40.